

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Danny Friddle,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 CoreCivic, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-23-02414-PHX-KML (ESW)

ORDER

15 Plaintiff Danny Friddle's reply in support of his motion for preliminary injunction
16 provides more information regarding his religious beliefs and why he believes defendants'
17 actions to accommodate them are inadequate. (Doc. 34.) Defendants must file a surreply
18 addressing Friddle's reply. The court notes defendants' response analyzed Friddle's claim
19 under *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78 (1987). In addition to any other issues defendants wish
20 to address, defendants must address Friddle's religious exercise claim under the standard
21 applicable to claims brought under the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons
22 Act (RLUIPA), 42 U.S.C. § 2000cc, et seq.¹ Specifically, defendants must address how
23 requiring prisoners to consume their religious meals in the dining hall is the least restrictive
24 means of furthering the penological goal of efficient prison administration when prisoners

25
26 ¹ The court recognizes its July 9, 2024, screening order identified First and Fourteenth
27 Amendment claims in count five. But count five of the first amended complaint explicitly
28 referenced RLUIPA (Doc. 8 at 12) and, in any event, plaintiff was not required to identify
the legal basis for his claim in his pleadings. *See Alvarez v. Hill*, 518 F.3d 1152, 1157–
1158 (9th Cir. 2008) (particularly when the plaintiff is a pro se litigant, courts must look at
facts alleged in the complaint to ascertain the claims at issue; the plaintiff need not cite to
any specific statutes or legal theories).

1 were previously permitted to consume religious meals in their cells. *See Ramirez v. Collier*,
2 595 U.S. 411, 427 (2022) (RLUIPA does not allow prison officials to rely on “broadly
3 formulated interests” and officials must “demonstrate that the compelling interest test is
4 satisfied through application of the challenged law [to] the particular claimant whose
5 sincere exercise of religion is being substantially burdened”) (quotation marks and citations
6 omitted).

7 **IT IS ORDERED** no later than **February 11, 2025**, defendants shall file a surreply
8 of no more than ten pages.

9 Dated this 5th day of February, 2025.

10
11 
12

13 **Honorable Krissa M. Lanham**
14 **United States District Judge**
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28